

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 22, 2004 the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 were pending, and rejected claims 1-8. Claims 1 and 4-8 have been amended, new claim 9 has been added, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-9 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Action the Examiner objected to claims 6 and 7. These claims have been amended in consideration of the examiners comments and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Action the Examiner rejected claim 8 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 8 has been amended and it is submitted that it satisfies the requirements of the statute. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 over Kohler or Kohler with Krause.

Kohler is directed to a system that sends specific parts of a set of information to different recipients where a first recipient would receive only the information for that first recipient and would not receive the information designated for a second recipient, and visa versa. As a result, each recipient only sees a part of the set of information.

In contrast, the present invention sends the set of information to the recipients and emphasizes or highlights the parts for each recipient. For example, assume that an organizer is creating a lecture series where all of the participants in the lecture series need to see the lecture schedule but where the organizer wants to make sure that each lecturer notices their part of the schedule. The organizer can highlight or emphasize the parts of the schedule corresponding to each lecturer but still send a broadcast message to the lecturers. In this situation, a first lecturer would receive the broadcast message including the entire schedule but with the part of the schedule of the first lecturer highlighted, the second lecturer would receive the broadcast message also including the entire schedule but with the part of the schedule of the second lecturer highlighted, etc. That is, each lecturer recipient would have the information most important to them highlighted. These aspects of the present invention are emphasized in independent claims 1 and 4-8. Kohler does not teach or suggest such.

Krause is directed to electronic reading of text and discusses nothing about sending messages with parts important to different receivers highlighted or emphasized. Krause adds nothing to Kohler with respect to the features of the invention discussed above.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are

patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 3 calls for not just emphasizing a keyword found the information by the part of the information including the keyword. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.


It is submitted that claim 8 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9/22/14

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501